

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 28, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-33 are all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-20, 22-28, and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-20, 22-28, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert (US Publication No. 2004/0044779) in view of Safadi (US Publication No. 2003/0126086) in view of Russ, et al. (US Patent No. 6,748,080) and in view of Hans, et al. (US Patent No. 7,200,575).

**Claim 1**

In order to expedite the prosecution for the present application and to ensure clarity in the record, Applicant request that the Examiner more particularly identify which reference is being cited for teaching the claimed elements.

Specifically, on pages 1-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites Lambert for teaching the claimed server (wherein if the server receives multimedia contents from one of a plurality of DRM server groups having a unique DRM solution respectively, the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents) and platform authentication unit. The Examiner then cites Safadi for teaching the other aspects of the claimed server (converts the received multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmits the converted multimedia contents to the client) and for teaching the claimed content conversion unit and license translation unit. The Examiner cites Russ for also teaching the claimed content conversion unit and the license translation unit.

Therefore, it is clear that the Examiner is citing multiple references for teaching the same aspect of the invention. Further, the Examiner has not shown where the claimed plurality of proxy managers constructed according to DRM server groups is disclosed in the cited art. Applicant requests that the Examiner particularly identify which reference and which aspect of references, is being cited for teaching the claimed elements.

Claim 1 recites “a server, wherein if the server receives multimedia contents from one of a plurality of DRM server groups having a unique DRM solution respectively, the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents.”

Lambert discloses a server for DRM which would provide a user with a copy of rights to content. See para. [0021]. The rights storage is distributed between a client and server. See para. [0111]. If a consumer attempts to access a DRM-encrypted content file that is subject to rights management restriction, the DRM client checks its local client-side rights caches for prior authorization to access the DRM-encrypted content file. See para. [0116]. Therefore, Lambert is merely directed to consumer’s access rights. Lambert does not teach or suggest a DRM server group having a unique DRM solution as claimed.

The Examiner asserts that Lambert discloses the claimed platform authentication unit of the server. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Lambert discloses “a platform authentication unit operable to request a license for multimedia contents from a corresponding DRM server group which provides the multimedia contents, and performing registration of the client.”

Lambert discloses a DRM bureau service which stores rights on the bureau service’s DRM servers and proactively serves rights in response to consumer demand. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the DRM servers of Lambert have a platform authentication unit

or that such a unit requests a license for multimedia contents from a corresponding DRM server group which provides the multimedia contents, or that a platform authentication unit performs registration of the client.

The Examiner then asserts that Safadi discloses a server which converts received multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmits the converted multimedia contents to the client. The Examiner also asserts that Safadi teaches the claimed content conversion unit and license translation unit.

Safadi discloses a processor for converting a DRM scheme to a native DRM scheme which is compatible with a consumer device used to process content. The DRM proxy device receives a request made by the consumer device for specific content over the second network and forwards the request to the content provider over the first network. See paras. [0023] and [0026].

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion of a license translation unit which translates a license received from a corresponding DRM server group into a license having a format suitable for the client. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that a license from a DRM server group is translated into a license having a format suitable for a client.

The Examiner also cites Russ for teaching the claimed license translation unit, however, there is no teaching or suggestion that a license translation unit translates a license received from the corresponding DRM server group into a license having a format suitable for the client, as claimed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 8, 17 and 24 recite similar elements, claims 8, 17 and 24 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

**II. Rejection of claims 5, 13-15, 21, 29-31, and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5, 13-15, 21, 29-31, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert in view of Safadi, in view of Russ, in view of Hans and further in view of Fransdonk (US Patent No. 7,228,427). Claims 5, 13-15, 21, 29-31, and 33 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 8, 17 and 24 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Fransdonk does not cure the deficiencies of Lambert, Safadi and Russ.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 28, 2009

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361